

REMARKS

This amendment is responsive to the Office Action dated July 24, 2009. After its entry, claims 1-17 are pending in this application and subject to examination. Claims 1 and 5 are amended. Support for these amendments are found at page 7, lines 15-17, of the present specification. No new matter is added.

Reconsideration of the application as amended is respectfully requested in view of the following remarks.

Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

Claims 1-10 and 12-17 stand rejected as obvious over U.S. Patent No. 6,097,147 to Baldo et al. (Baldo) in view of U.S. Patent App. Pub. No. 2002/0122900 to Ueda et al. (Ueda). Claims 11, 15, and 16 stand rejected as obvious over Baldo in view of Ueda and further in view of U.S. Patent App. Pub. No. 2001/0000943 A1 to Fukuoka et al. (Fukuoka). Claim 17 stands rejected as obvious over Baldo in view of Ueda and further in view of U.S. Patent. No. 6,299,796 B1 to Igarashi (Igarashi). Applicants respectfully traverse.

Claims 1-10 and 12-17

Applicants maintain that claims 1-10 and 12-17 are non-obvious over the combined teachings of Baldo and Ueda for the reasons previously set forth in the amendment submitted on March 24, 2009. In the July 24, 2009 Office Action, the Examiner maintains that Applicants showing of unexpected results is still not commensurate in scope with the amended claims presented in the May 22, 2009 amendment. Applicants respectfully disagree. However, in the interest of expediting prosecution, Applicants have amended claims 1 and 5 to limit the definition of Aryl to "is the same or different at each instance and is composed of phenyl groups, contains a total of from 5 to 18 aromatic carbon atoms and may be substituted by one or more R radicals." Applicants submit that this definition of aryl does not embrace condensed aromatic groups such as pyrenyl or coronenyl. Applicants submit that the showing of unexpected results

is now commensurate in scope with claims 1-10 and 12-17, as amended. As such, Applicants submit that these amended claims are non-obvious over the combined teachings of Baldo and Ueda and respectfully request withdrawal of this rejection.

Claims 11, 15, and 16

The remarks *supra* regarding claims 1-10 and 12-17 are incorporated herein by reference in their entirety. Applicants submit that claims 11, 15, and 16, as amended, are non-obvious over the combined teachings of Baldo, Ueda, and Fukuoka for the same reasons that amended claims 1-10 and 12-17 are non-obvious over the combined teachings of Baldo and Ueda. As such, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of this rejection.

Claim 17

The remarks *supra* regarding claims 1-10 and 12-17 are incorporated herein by reference in their entirety. Applicants submit that claim 17, as amended, is non-obvious over the combined teachings of Baldo, Ueda, and Igarishi for the same reasons that amended claims 1-10 and 12-17 are non-obvious over the combined teachings of Baldo and Ueda. As such, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of this rejection.

In view of the foregoing amendment and remarks, Applicants believe the pending application is in condition for allowance.

U.S. Patent Application Serial No. 10/563,581
Amendment dated October 26, 2009
Reply to Office Action of July 24, 2009

Docket No.: 14113-00141-US

Applicants believe no fee is due with this amendment. However, if a fee is due, the Director is hereby authorized to charge our Deposit Account No. 03-2775, under Order No. 14113-00141-US, from which the undersigned is authorized to draw.

Dated: October 26, 2009

Respectfully submitted,

Electronic signature: /Eamonn P. Morrison/
Eamonn P. Morrison
Registration No.: 55,841
CONNOLLY BOVE LODGE & HUTZ LLP
1007 North Orange Street
P. O. Box 2207
Wilmington, Delaware 19899-2207
(302) 658-9141
(302) 658-5614 (Fax)
Attorney for Applicant